arXiv:1504.00726v2 [math.DS] 9 Apr 2015

General KAM theorems and their applications to invariant tori with prescribed frequencies [*]

Junxiang Xu [†], Xuezhu Lu[‡]
Department of Mathematics, Southeast University
Nanjing 210096, China

April 10, 2015

In this paper we develop some new KAM-technique to prove two general KAM theorems for nearly integrable hamiltonian systems without assuming any non-degeneracy condition. Many of KAM-type results (including the classical KAM theorem) are special cases of our theorems under some non-degeneracy condition and some smoothness condition. Moreover, we can obtain some interesting results about KAM tori with prescribed frequencies.

Key Words: hamiltonian system; KAM iteration; invariant tori; non-degeneracy condition.

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the persistence of invariant tori of integrable hamiltonian system under small perturbation, which has been the fundamental problem of hamiltonian system and also the motivation of many KAM theorems [1, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. As is well known, KAM method becomes a mighty instrument to deal with such that quasi-periodic problem with the notorious small divisors. The proof of KAM theorems are based on the KAM iteration, involved with certain small divisor condition or non-degeneracy condition [4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17]. In this paper, we develop some new KAM technique to prove two general KAM theorems without imposing small divisor condition or non-degeneracy condition, which can be applied to diverse cases to obtain some interesting results. These general KAM theorems make no sense if no small divisor condition or non-degeneracy condition is assumed.

Let $H(q,p) = h(p) + f(q,p)$, where $(q,p) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times D$, with $\mathbb{T}^n$ the usual n-dimensional torus and D a bounded simply connected open domain of $\mathbb{R}^n$. $h(p)$ and $f(q,p)$ are real analytic on $\bar{D}$ and $\bar{D} \times \mathbb{T}^n$, respectively. The corresponding hamiltonian system is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q} &= \quad H_p(q,p) = h_p(p) + f_p(q,p) \\ \dot{p} &= -H_q(q,p) = \qquad\quad -f_q(q,p) \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

---

[*] The work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China(11371090)

[†] Corresponding author, E-mail address: xujun@seu.edu.cn

[‡] E-mail: Jennysundate@163.com

At first, by a transformation $p = \xi + I$ and $q = \theta$, $\xi \in D$, we introduce a parameter ξ and then the hamiltonian system (1.1) is equivalent to a parameterized hamiltonian system:

$$\begin{aligned} H(q,p) &= h(\xi) + \langle h_p(\xi), I\rangle + f_h(\xi; I) + f(\theta, \xi + I) \\ &= e + \langle \omega(\xi), I\rangle + P(\xi; \theta, I), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$e = h(\xi),\ \omega(\xi) = h_p(\xi),\ f_h(\xi; I) = h(I + \xi) - h(\xi) - \langle h_p(\xi), I\rangle,$$
$$P(\xi; \theta, I) = f_h(\xi; I) + f(\theta, \xi + I),$$

and $\xi \in \Pi \subset D$ is regarded as parameter. Here e is an energy constant and usually is omitted in KAM steps. $\omega : \xi \to \omega(\xi)$ is called frequency mapping, and P is a small perturbation term.

This technique of introducing parameter was first used by Pöschel in [15], leading to separation of invariant tori and their frequencies in KAM iteration.

Then the corresponding hamiltonian system becomes

$$\begin{cases} \dot\theta = \quad H_I = \omega(\xi) + P_I(\xi; \theta, I) \\ \dot I = -H_\theta = \qquad\quad -P_\theta(\xi; \theta, I) \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

Thus, the persistence of a family of invariant tori $\mathbb{T}^n \times \{p\}$ for (1.1) is reduced to that of invariant tori $\mathbb{T}^n \times \{0\}$ with frequencies $\omega(\xi)$ for hamiltonian system (1.2) with the parameter $\xi \in \Pi$.

Without loss of generality, we consider the parameterized hamiltonian system (1.2) with $H = H(\xi; \theta, I) = \langle \omega(\xi), I\rangle + P(\xi; \theta, I)$, where P is a perturbation term.

Let $0 < \alpha < 1, \tau > n - 1$ and

$$O_{\alpha,\tau} = \big\{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n :\ \big|\langle \omega, k\rangle\big| \geq \frac{\alpha}{|k|^\tau},\ \forall\, k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}\big\}. \tag{1.3}$$

If $P = 0$, for every parameter $\xi \in \Pi$ the system (1.2) admits an invariant torus $T^n \times \{0\}$ with frequency $\omega(\xi)$. The classical KAM theorem says that if the frequency mapping is non-degenerate in Kolmogorov's sense:

$$\det(\partial_\xi \omega) = \det(h_{pp}) \neq 0,$$

then for most $\xi \in \Pi$ such that $\omega(\xi) \in O_{\alpha,\tau}$, the invariant tori with frequencies $\omega(\xi)$ will survive of arbitrarily sufficiently small perturbations [1, 7, 9, 13, 15, 14].

Later, Kolmogorov's non-degeneracy condition has been weakened to Rüssmann's non-degeneracy condition [16, 17, 20, 18]:

$$a_1\omega_1(\xi) + a_2\omega_2(\xi) + \cdots + a_n\omega_n(\xi) \not\equiv 0 \ \text{ on } \Pi, \tag{1.4}$$

for all $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. That means, under the condition (1.4), for most ξ in the sense of Lebesgue measure, the perturbed system (1.2) still has invariant tori with frequencies in $O_{\alpha,\tau}$. However, since the range of the frequency mapping ω may be on a sub-manifold, the frequencies of persisting invariant tori may not come from unperturbed ones. Thus it is difficult to provide accurate information about the frequencies of KAM tori.

More recently, some authors turn to study the persistence of invariant tori with prescribed frequency. In the paper [21], assuming $\omega_0 \in O_{\alpha,\tau}$ and $\deg(\omega, \Pi, \omega_0) \neq 0$, the authors proved the perturbed parameterized system (1.2) still has an invariant torus with ω_0 as its frequency, i.e., the torus with the prescribed frequency ω_0 persists under small perturbations.

However, the result in [21] cannot be generalized to lower dimensional elliptic invariant tori. In the Kolmogorov non-degenerate case, Bourgain considered the following hamiltonian

$$H(\omega; \theta, I, z, \bar{z}) = \langle \omega, I \rangle + \Omega(\omega) z\, \bar{z} + P(\omega; \theta, I, z, \bar{z}),$$

and obtained a similar result for lower dimensional elliptic invariant tori [2]. More precisely, suppose $\omega_0 \in O_\alpha$ and $(\omega_0, \Omega_0) = (\omega_0, \Omega(\omega_0))$ satisfy the first Melnikov condition, then for most of sufficiently small λ, there exists ξ such that the above perturbed hamiltonian has an elliptic lower dimensional invariant torus $\mathbb{T}^n \times \{0, 0, 0\}$ with the frequency $(1 + \lambda)\omega_0$.

In this paper, we are mainly interested in the persistence of invariant tori with prescribed frequency. For this purpose, we will develop a new technique of KAM iteration to separate non-degeneracy condition from KAM iteration. The key lies in an explicit extension of small divisors to the parameter definition domain. Our extension of small divisors always works even though the small divisor condition does not hold for every $\xi \in \Pi$. Thus the constructed symplectic transformation and the new perturbation are well defined for all parameters. However, only for these parameters such that the small divisor condition holds, the new hamiltonian is exactly from the original one under the symplectic transformation; otherwise, we only obtain a formal new hamiltonian, it may have no relation with the previous hamiltonian and thus cannot provide any useful information.

To be more precise, let $\alpha > 0, \tau > n - 1$ and a family of parameterized hamiltonian be

$$\{H(\xi; \theta, I) = \langle \omega(\xi), I \rangle + P(\xi; \theta, I) : \ \xi \in \Pi\}.$$

By our KAM iteration, we can have a family of parameterized normal hamiltonian

$$\{H_*(\xi; \theta, I) = \langle \omega_*(\xi), I \rangle + P_*(\xi; \theta, I) : \ \xi \in \Pi\},$$

where the frequency mapping $\omega_*(\xi)$ is a small perturbation of ω and $P_* = O(I^2)$. For $\xi \in \Pi$, if $\omega_*(\xi) \in O_\alpha$, the original hamiltonian $H(\xi; \cdot)$ is just normalized to $H_*(\xi; \cdot)$ and then has an invariant torus with frequency $\omega_*(\xi)$. If $\omega_*(\xi) \notin O_\alpha$, we cannot have any relation between $H(\xi; \cdot)$ and $H_*(\xi; \cdot)$; in this case $H_*(\xi; \cdot)$ does not provided any information of $H(\xi; \cdot)$. Thus, if $\omega_*(\xi) \notin O_\alpha$ for all $\xi \in \Pi$, our result makes no sense.

2 Main Results

To state our theorems, we first give some notations. Define a small neighborhood of $\mathbb{T}^n \times \{0\}$ by

$$D(s, r) = \big\{(\theta, I) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n : \ |\mathrm{Im}\ \theta|_\infty \leq s,\ |I|_1 \leq r\big\},$$

where $|\mathrm{Im}\ \theta|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\mathrm{Im}\theta_i|$, $|I|_1 = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} |I_i|$. Let $\Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded connected closed domain.

Consider a parameterized hamiltonian

$$H(\xi;\theta,I)=\langle\omega(\xi),I\rangle+P(\xi;\theta,I). \tag{2.1}$$

Suppose $H(\xi;\theta,I)$ is real analytic in $(\theta,I)\in D(s,r)$ and C^m-smooth in $\xi\in\Pi$ with $m\geq 0$.

We expand $P(\xi;\theta,I)$ as the Fourier series with respect to θ

$$P(\xi;\theta,I)=\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^n}P_k(\xi;I)\,e^{\mathrm{i}\langle k,\theta\rangle}.$$

Let $\mathbb{Z}^n_+$ consist of all the integer vectors with non-negative components, and then $P_k(\xi;I)=\sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}^n_+}P_{k,\ell}(\xi)\,I^\ell$.

Define

$$\|P\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D(s,r)}=\sum_k\|P_k\|_{\Pi;r}\,e^{s|k|},$$

where $\|P_k\|_{\Pi;r}=\sup_{|I|_1\leq r}|\sum_{\ell\geq 0}\|P_{k,\ell}\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)}I^\ell|$ with the weighted norm

$$\|P_{k,\ell}\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)}=\max_{|\beta|\leq m}\alpha^{|\beta|}\max_{\xi\in\Pi}\left|\frac{\partial^\beta P_{k,\ell}(\xi)}{\partial^\beta\xi}\right|.$$

The weight α is supplemented so that the relevant KAM estimates in the sequel can be written in a succinct way.

Theorem 2.1 *Consider the hamiltonian (2.1) and suppose H is real analytic in (θ,I) on $D(s,r)$ and C^m-smooth in ξ on Π. Let $O_{\alpha,\tau}$ be defined as (1.3). For any $0<\alpha\leq 1$, $\tau>n-1$ and $m\geq 0$, there exists a sufficiently small $\gamma>0$, such that if*

$$\|P\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D(s,r)}=\epsilon\leq\alpha r s^{\tau'}\gamma \text{ with } \tau'=n+(m+1)\tau+m,$$

then there exist a family of symplectic mappings $\{\Phi_*(\xi;\cdot)\mid\xi\in\Pi\}$ and a family of hamiltonian $\{H_*(\xi;\cdot)\mid\xi\in\Pi\}$ such that the following conclusions hold:

(i) $\Phi_*(\xi;\theta,I)$ is analytic in (θ,I) on $D(s/2,\,r/2)$ and C^m-smooth in ξ on Π, and maps $D(s/2,\,r/2)$ into $D(s,\,r)$. Moreover,

$$\|W(\Phi_*-id)\,\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D(s/2,\,r/2)}\leq c\gamma,$$

where $W=diag(\rho^{-1}I_n,r^{-1}I_n)$ with $\rho=s/20$ and I_n the n-th unit matrix.

(ii)

$$H_*(\xi;\theta,I)=\langle\omega_*(\xi),I\rangle+P_*(\xi;\theta,I)$$

is analytic in (θ,I) on $D(s/2,\,r/2)$ and C^m-smooth in ξ on Π, with the estimates

$$\|\omega_*-\omega\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)}\leq 2\epsilon/r,\quad P_*(\xi;\theta,I)=O(I^2).$$

(iii) If $\omega_*(\xi)\in O_{\alpha,\tau}$, we have

$$H\circ\Phi_*(\xi;\theta,I)=H_*(\xi;\theta,I).$$

Thus the hamiltonian $H(\xi;\cdot)$ has an invariant torus $\Phi_*(\xi;\mathbb{T}^n,0)$ with the frequency $\omega_*(\xi)$.

Next we consider the perturbation of elliptic lower dimensional invariant tori and establish an analogous KAM theorem. When it causes no confusion, we still employ the same notations to denote the variables and sequencies.

Define a complex neighborhood of $\mathbb{T}^n \times \{0,0,0\}$ by

$$D(s,r) = \{(\theta, I, z, \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^{\bar{n}} \times \mathbb{C}^{\bar{n}} : \ |\mathrm{Im}\theta|_\infty \leq s, |r|_1 \leq r^2, |z|_2 \leq r, |\bar{z}|_2 \leq r\}.$$

Consider a parameterized hamiltonian

$$H(\xi;\theta,I,z,\bar{z}) = \langle \omega(\xi), I\rangle + \langle \Omega(\xi), z\,\bar{z}\rangle + P(\xi;\theta,I,z,\bar{z}) \tag{2.2}$$

defined for $(\xi;\theta,I,z,\bar{z}) \in \Pi \times D(s,r)$, where

$$\Omega = (\Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_{\bar{n}}) \quad \text{and} \quad z\bar{z} = (z_1\bar{z}_1, \ldots, z_{\bar{n}}\bar{z}_{\bar{n}}). \tag{2.3}$$

The associated symplectic structure is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} dI_i \wedge d\theta_i + \mathrm{i} \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} dz_j \wedge d\bar{z}_j,$$

with $\mathrm{i} = \sqrt{-1}$. Suppose H is real analytic in $(\theta, I, z, \bar{z})$ on $D(s,r)$ and C^m-smooth in ξ on Π with $m \geq 0$.

Expand P as the Fourier series with respect to θ

$$P(\xi;\theta,I,z,\bar{z}) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^n} P_k(\xi;I,z,\bar{z})\, e^{\mathrm{i}\langle k,\theta\rangle}.$$

Let

$$P_k(\xi;I,z,\bar{z}) = \sum_{\ell_1\in\mathbb{Z}^n_+, \ell_2,\ell_3\in Z^{\bar{n}}_+} P_{k,\ell}(\xi)\, I^{\ell_1} z^{\ell_2} \bar{z}^{\ell_3}, \quad \ell = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$$

Then we define

$$\|P\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D(s,r)} = \sum_k \|P_k\|_{\Pi;r}\, e^{s|k|},$$

where

$$\|P_k\|_{\Pi;r} = \sup_{|I|_1\leq r^2, |z|_2\leq r, |\bar{z}|_2\leq r} \Big|\sum_\ell \|P_{k,\ell}\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)} I^{\ell_1} z^{\ell_2} \bar{z}^{\ell_3}\Big|.$$

Set $\mathcal{Z} = \{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^{\bar{n}} : \ k \neq 0, |l| \leq 2\}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{l \in \mathbb{Z}^{\bar{n}} : \ 1 \leq |l| \leq 2\}$. For fixed constants $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\tau > n-1$, define $\tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}$ as

$$\tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau} = \big\{(\omega,\Omega) : \ \big|\langle \omega, k\rangle + \langle l, \Omega\rangle\big| \geq \frac{\alpha}{|k|^\tau}, \ (k,l) \in \mathcal{Z} \text{ and } |\langle l, \Omega\rangle| \geq \alpha, \ l \in \mathcal{L}\big\}. \tag{2.4}$$

Theorem 2.2 *Consider the hamiltonian* (2.2) *and suppose H is real analytic in $(\theta, I, z, \bar{z})$ on $D(s,r)$ and C^m-smooth in ξ on Π. Let $\tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau}$ be defined by (2.4). For any $1 \geq \alpha > 0$, $\tau > n-1$ and $m \geq 0$, there exists a sufficiently small $\gamma > 0$, such that if*

$$\|P\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D(s,r)} = \epsilon \leq \alpha r^2 s^{\tau'} \gamma \textit{ with } \tau' = n + (m+1)\tau + m,$$

then there exists a family of symplectic mappings $\{\Phi_*(\xi;\cdot) \mid \xi \in \Pi\}$ *and a family of hamiltonian* $\{H_*(\xi;\cdot) \mid \xi \in \Pi\}$ *such that the following conclusions hold:*

(i) $\Phi_*(\xi;\theta,I,z,\bar z)$ *is analytic in* $(\theta,I,z,\bar z)$ *on* $D(s/2,\, r/2)$ *and* C^m*-smooth in* ξ *on* Π*, and maps* $D(s/2,\, r/2)$ *into* $D(s,\, r)$*. Moreover,*

$$\|W(\Phi_* - id)\,\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D(s/2,\,r/2)} \le c\gamma,$$

where $W = diag(\rho^{-1}I_n, r^{-2}I_n, r^{-1}I_{\bar n}, r^{-1}I_{\bar n})$ *with* $\rho = s/20$ *and* I_n *being the n-th unit matrix.*

(ii)

$$H_*(\xi;\theta,I,z,\bar z) = \langle \omega_*(\xi), I\rangle + \langle \Omega_*(\xi), z\bar z\rangle + P_*(\xi;\theta,I,z,\bar z)$$

is analytic in $(\theta,I,z,\bar z)$ *on* $D(s/2,\, r/2)$ *and* C^m*-smooth in* ξ *on* Π *, with the estimates*

$$\|\omega_* - \omega\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)} \le 2\epsilon/r^2, \quad \|\Omega_* - \Omega\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)} \le 2\epsilon/r^2,$$

and

$$\partial_I^{\ell_1}\partial_z^{\ell_2}\partial_{\bar z}^{\ell_3}P_*(\xi;\theta,0,0,0) = 0,\ \forall\, 2|\ell_1| + |\ell_2| + |\ell_3| \le 2.$$

(iii) If $(\omega_*(\xi),\Omega_*(\xi)) \in \tilde O_{\alpha,\tau}$*, we have*

$$H\circ\Phi_*(\xi;\theta,I,z,\bar z) = H_*(\xi;\theta,I,z,\bar z).$$

Thus the hamiltonian $H(\xi;\cdots)$ *has an elliptic lower invariant torus* $\Phi_*(\xi;\mathbb{T}^n,0,0,0)$ *with* $\omega_*(\xi)$ *being the tangential frequency and* $\Omega_*(\xi))$ *the normal frequency.*

Remark 2.1 *Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 imply that the existence of KAM tori is equivalent to whether the final frequencies* ω_* *belong to* $O_{\tau,\alpha}$ *or* (ω_*,Ω_*) *belong to* $\tilde O_{\tau,\alpha}$*. Note that in our theorems we do not need any non-degeneracy assumption and any strict smoothness condition for parameter as in the previous KAM theorems; thus our results are more general.*

3 Stability of Diophantine Frequency

For application of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, in this section we make some preliminaries to explore existence of Diophantine frequencies in the image set $\{\omega_*(\xi) : \xi \in \Pi\}$ or $\{(\omega_*(\xi),\Omega_*(\xi)) : \xi \in \Pi\}$. Note that $\omega_* = \omega + \hat\omega$ is only a small perturbation of ω and $\|\cdot\|_{C^m(\Pi)} \le \alpha^{-m}\|\cdot\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)}$. By the theorems, we have $\|\hat\omega\|_{C^m(\Pi)} \le \sigma$, where $\sigma = \frac{2\epsilon}{r\alpha^m}$ or $\sigma = \frac{2\epsilon}{r^2\alpha^m}$ in the case of elliptic lower dimensional tori. This observation illustrates that the stability of Diophantine frequency is quite important for our problem.

Stability of prescribed frequency.

Let $\omega_0 \in \omega(\Pi) = \{\omega(\xi) : \xi \in \Pi\}$ and $\omega_* = \omega + \hat\omega$. If there exists a sufficiently small constant $\sigma_0 > 0$, such that if $\|\hat\omega\|_{C^m(\Pi)} \le \sigma_0$, we have a λ with $|\lambda| << 1$, such that $(1+\lambda)\omega_0 \in \omega_*(\Pi)$, we say the direction of ω_0 is stable in $\omega(\Pi)$; in particular, if $\lambda = 0$, we say ω_0 is stable.

The above definition suggests that the stability of Diophantine frequency corresponds to the persistence of invariant tori with the prescribed frequency. When the direction of a diophantine frequency is stable, there exists an invariant torus with the frequency only being a dilation of the prescribed frequency. This kind of invariant tori carry certain information of frequencies from the integrable system.

In what follows, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ always indicates a row vector. The notation $\|\cdot\|_m$ is used in place of $\|\cdot\|_{C^m(\Pi)}$ for short, especially, $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_0$. We always denote by $\omega_* = \omega + \hat{\omega}$ and by $\Omega_* = \Omega + \hat{\Omega}$ small perturbations of ω and Ω, respectively.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\omega(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Omega(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}$ belong to $C^1(\Pi)$ with*

$$\text{rank }(\partial_\xi \omega) = n \quad \textit{and} \quad |\Omega(\xi)| \geq c > 0, \ \forall \xi \in \Pi.$$

Denote by $U = (\omega, \Omega)^T$ the transpose of (ω, Ω). Let $A(\xi) = (\partial_\xi U, U)$ and

$$\partial_\xi U = (\partial_{\xi_1} U, \ldots, \partial_{\xi_n} U).$$

Suppose $\text{rank}(A(\xi)) = n + 1$, *for all $\xi \in \Pi$. Let $\tilde{\omega} = \omega/\Omega$. Then we have*

$$\text{rank }(\partial_\xi \tilde{\omega}) = n, \quad \forall \xi \in \Pi.$$

Proof: Set $V = (\tilde{\omega}, 1)^T$ and then $U = \Omega \cdot V$. It follows that

$$A = (\partial_{\xi_1}\Omega \cdot V + \Omega \cdot \partial_{\xi_1} V, \ \ldots, \partial_{\xi_n}\Omega \cdot V + \Omega \cdot \partial_{\xi_n} V, \ \Omega \cdot V).$$

Let

$$B = (\partial_{\xi_1} V, \ldots, \partial_{\xi_n} V, \ V).$$

Note that $\partial_{\xi_j}\Omega$ are scalar functions for all arbitrary j. Therefore,

$$\text{rank}(B(\xi)) = \text{rank}(A(\xi)) = n + 1$$

and then rank $(\partial_\xi \tilde{\omega}) = n$. □

Lemma 3.2 *Let $\omega(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ belong to $C^1(\Pi)$ and ω^T be its transpose. Suppose that for all $\xi \in \Pi$ we have*

$$\text{rank }(\partial_\xi \omega) = n - 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \text{rank }(\partial_\xi \omega^T, \omega^T) = n.$$

Denote by

$$\tilde{\omega} = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{j-1}, \omega_{j+1}, \ldots, \omega_n), \quad \tilde{\xi} = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_n).$$

Then, for any $\xi \in \Pi$ there exist i and j with $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that rank $(\partial_{\tilde{\xi}} \tilde{\omega}) = n - 1$. *Moreover, if $\omega_j(\xi) \neq 0$, we have* rank $(\partial_{\tilde{\xi}} \frac{\tilde{\omega}}{\omega_j}) = n - 1$.

Proof: This lemma can be proved by directly applying Lemma 3.1. □

Lemma 3.3 *Let $\omega(\xi) = (\omega_1(\xi), \ldots, \omega_n(\xi))$ and $\omega_* = \omega + \hat{\omega}$ belong to $C^1(\Pi)$, where*

$$\xi = (\tilde{\xi}, \xi_n) \in \Pi = \widetilde{\Pi} \times [\xi_{0n} - \beta, \xi_{0n} + \beta] \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Set $\omega_0 = \omega(\xi_0)$, $\xi_0 = (\tilde{\xi}_0, \xi_{0n}) \in \Pi$,

$$\omega^\flat = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{n-1}) \quad \textit{and} \quad \hat{\omega}^\flat = (\hat{\omega}_1, \ldots, \hat{\omega}_{n-1}).$$

Let $\lambda(\xi) = \omega_{0n}^{-1} \cdot \omega_{*n}(\xi) - 1$. *Suppose for* $\xi \in \Pi$, $|\omega_n(\xi)| \geq c > 0$, *and the Jacobian matrix* $\partial_{\tilde{\xi}}(\frac{\omega^\flat}{\omega_n})$ *is non-degenerate. Then, there exist sufficiently small positive constants* σ_0 *and* δ_0, *such that if* $\|\hat{\omega}\| = \sigma < \sigma_0$ *and* $|\xi_n - \xi_{0n}| \leq \delta_0$, *there exists a unique* $\xi_* = \xi_*(\xi_n) \in \Pi$, *which is continuously differentiable in* ξ_n, *such that*

$$\omega_*(\xi_*) = (1 + \lambda(\xi_*))\omega_0.$$

Moreover, $\lambda(\xi_*) = O(|\xi_n - \xi_{0n}| + \sigma)$.

Proof: Rewrite as $\omega_* = (\omega_n + \hat{\omega}_n) \cdot \tilde{\omega}_*$, where $\tilde{\omega}_* = (\omega_n^{-1} \cdot \omega^\flat + a(\xi),\ 1)$ and

$$a(\xi) = -\frac{\hat{\omega}_n}{\omega_n(\omega_n + \hat{\omega}_n)} \cdot \omega^\flat + \frac{1}{\omega_n + \hat{\omega}_n} \cdot \hat{\omega}^\flat.$$

It is easy to verify $\|a\| \leq c_1\sigma$.

Note that the above functions are all uniformly continuous in $(\tilde{\xi}, \xi_n)$. The assumption also implies $\omega_n^{-1} \cdot \omega^\flat$ is non-degenerate uniformly with respect to $\tilde{\xi}$. Hence, there exists a small δ_0 such that if σ is sufficiently small, for $|\xi_n - \xi_{0n}| \leq \delta_0$, we have a unique $\tilde{\xi}_* = \tilde{\xi}_*(\xi_n)$ and $\xi_* = (\tilde{\xi}_*(\xi_n), \xi_n)$, such that

$$\omega_n^{-1}(\xi_*) \cdot \omega^\flat(\xi_*) + a(\xi_*) = \omega_{0n}^{-1} \cdot \omega_0^\flat.$$

Moreover, $\tilde{\xi}_*$ is differentiable in ξ_n, and satisfies

$$|\tilde{\xi}_*(\xi_n) - \tilde{\xi}_0| \leq c_2|\xi_n - \xi_{0n}| + c_3\sigma.$$

In view of $\omega_{0n} \cdot \tilde{\omega}_*(\xi_*) = \omega_0$, it is easy to see that

$$\omega_*(\xi_*) = (1 + \lambda(\xi_*))\omega_0.$$

Moreover,

$$\lambda(\xi_*) = \omega_{0n}^{-1} \cdot \big(\omega_n(\xi_*) - \omega_n(\xi_0) + \hat{\omega}_n(\xi_*)\big) = O(|\xi_n - \xi_{0n}| + \sigma)$$

as $\xi_n \to \xi_{0n}$ and $\sigma \to 0$. □

Proposition 3.1 *Let* $\omega(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and* $\omega_*(\xi) = \omega(\xi) + \hat{\omega}(\xi)$ *belong to* $C^1(\Pi)$. *Suppose the following Bruno non-degeneracy condition hold:*

$$\text{rank } (\partial_\xi \omega) = n - 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \text{rank } (\partial_\xi \omega^T, \omega^T) = n, \quad \forall \xi \in \Pi. \tag{3.1}$$

Then $\omega(\Pi) \cap O_{\alpha,\tau} \neq \varnothing$. *Moreover, let*

$$\omega_0 = \omega(\xi_0) \in O_{\alpha,\tau}, \quad \xi_0 \in \Pi.$$

There exists sufficiently small positive constants δ_0 *and* σ_0 *such that if* $\|\hat{\omega}\| = \sigma < \sigma_0$, *the set* $\omega_*(\Pi)$ *contains a continuously differentiable one-parameter family of Diophantine frequencies with the form* $(1 + \lambda(\eta))\omega_0$, *where* λ *is continuously differentiable for* $|\eta| \leq \delta_0$, *and satisfies* $\lambda(\eta) = O(|\eta| + \sigma)$.

Proof: It is well known from the Bruno non-degeneracy condition that if α is sufficiently small, $\omega(\Pi) \cap O_{\alpha,\tau}$ is nonempty.

Since ω_0 is Diophantine, it follows $\omega_{0j} \neq 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Applying Lemma 3.2, there exists a small neighbor Π_0 of ξ_0 in Π and i, j, such that for all $\xi \in \Pi_0$, we have $\omega_j(\xi) \neq 0$,

$$\text{rank } (\partial_{\tilde{\xi}} \tilde{\omega}) = n - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rank } (\partial_{\tilde{\xi}} \frac{\tilde{\omega}}{\omega_j}) = n - 1,$$

where $\tilde{\omega}$ and $\tilde{\xi}$ are defined as in Lemma 3.2.

Then Lemma 3.3 ensures sufficiently small constants $\sigma_0 > 0$ and $\delta_0 > 0$, such that for $\|\hat{\omega}\| = \sigma < \sigma_0$ and $|\xi_j - \xi_{0j}| < \delta_0$, we have a unique $\xi_* = \xi_*(\xi_j)$, that is continuously differentiable in ξ_j, such that

$$\omega_*(\xi_*) = (1 + \lambda(\xi_*))\omega_0.$$

Moreover, $\lambda(\xi_*) = O(|\xi_j - \xi_{0j}| + \sigma))$. Let $\xi_j = \eta + \xi_{0j}$, then we finish the proof. $\square$

Lemma 3.4 *Let $\omega_0 = (\omega_{01}, \omega_{02})$ satisfy the Diophantine condition*

$$|k_1\omega_{01} + k_2\omega_{02}| \geq \frac{\alpha}{|k|^\tau}, \ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\tau > 1$. Set $f_k(\lambda) = k_1(\omega_{01} + \lambda) + k_2\omega_{02}$, and

$$\Pi_{\lambda_0} = \left\{\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0] : \ |f_k(\lambda)| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{2\tau+2}}, \ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}\right\}.$$

Then Π_{λ_0} is a non-empty subset with $\text{meas}([0, \lambda_0] \setminus \Pi_{\lambda_0}) = o(\lambda_0)$ *as $\lambda_0 \to 0$.*

Proof: Note that $\omega_{01}, \omega_{02} \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, assume $|\lambda_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\omega_{01}|$. Observe that there exist positive constants c_1, c_2 and c_3 such that if $|k_1| \geq c_1|k_2|$ or $|k_2| \geq c_2|k_1|$, $|f_k(\lambda)| \geq c_3 > 0$. Then $|f_k(\lambda)| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{2\tau+2}}$ holds for sufficiently small α. Hence, we consider the case of $|k_2|/c_2 < |k_1| < c_1|k_2|$.

If $|\lambda| \leq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{\tau+1}}$, the Diophantine assumption (3.2) implies $|f_k(\lambda)| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^\tau}$. Consequently, we consider these k satisfying $\frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{\tau+1}} < \lambda_0$ and $|k_2|/c_2 < |k_1| < c_1|k_2|$, and denote by N_{λ_0} the set consisting of these k.

For $k \in N_{\lambda_0}$, define the resonant set by

$$\Delta_k = \left\{\lambda \in [\frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{\tau+1}}, \lambda_0] : \ |f_k(\lambda)| < \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{2\tau+2}}\right\}.$$

Then we have $\text{meas}(\Delta_k) \leq \frac{\alpha}{2|k_1|\cdot|k|^{2\tau+2}}$. In view of $[0, \lambda_0] \setminus \Pi_{\lambda_0} \subset \bigcup_{k \in N_{\lambda_0}} \Delta_k$, thus

$$\text{meas}([0, \lambda_0] \setminus \Pi_{\lambda_0}) \leq \sum_{k \in N_{\lambda_0}} \frac{1}{|k_1|} \cdot \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{2\tau+2}}.$$

It easily follows

$$\text{meas}([0, \lambda_0] \setminus \Pi_{\lambda_0}) \leq c\lambda_0 \sum_{k_2 > c(\frac{\alpha}{2\lambda_0})^{\frac{1}{\tau+1}}} \frac{1}{|k_2|^{\tau+1}} \leq c\lambda_0 (\frac{\lambda_0}{\alpha})^{\frac{\tau-1}{\tau+1}}. \qquad \square$$

Proposition 3.2 *Let* $\omega_0 = (\omega_{01}, \omega_{02})$ *satisfy* (3.2) *and* $\omega_* = \omega_0 + \hat{\omega}(\epsilon)$*, where* $\hat{\omega}(\epsilon)$ *is continuous in the small parameter* $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$ *with* $\hat{\omega}(0) = 0$*. Then there exists a non-empty set* $I^*_{\epsilon_0} \subset [0, \epsilon_0]$ *with continuous carnality such that for* $\epsilon \in I^*_{\epsilon_0}$*, we have*

$$|\langle k, \omega_*(\epsilon)\rangle| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{2\tau+2}}, \ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}.$$

Moreover, when $\hat{\omega}(\epsilon)$ *is continuously differentiable on* $[0, \epsilon_0]$ *with* $\|\hat{\omega}(\epsilon)\|_1 \leq c$*,* $I^*_{\epsilon_0}$ *has positive measure.*

Proof: Rewrite as $\omega_* = \frac{\omega_{*2}}{\omega_{02}}(\omega_{01} + \lambda(\epsilon), \omega_{02})$, where $\lambda = \frac{\omega_{02}}{\omega_{*2}} \cdot \hat{\omega}_1 - \frac{\omega_{01}}{\omega_{*2}} \cdot \hat{\omega}_2$. Let $\tilde{\epsilon}_0$ be sufficiently small such that for $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0$, we have $\|\hat{\omega}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\min\{|\omega_{01}|, |\omega_{02}|\}$ and then $|\frac{\omega_{*2}}{\omega_{02}}| \geq 1/2$. Thus $\lambda(\epsilon)$ is continuous on $[0, \tilde{\epsilon}_0]$ with $\lambda(0) = 0$. Set $\lambda_0 = \max_{[0,\tilde{\epsilon}_0]} |\lambda(\epsilon)|$.

If $\lambda_0 = 0$, for all $\epsilon \in [0, \tilde{\epsilon}_0]$, $\omega_*(\epsilon) = \frac{\omega_{*2}}{\omega_{02}}(\omega_{01}, \omega_{02})$. Therefore,

$$|\langle k, \omega_*(\epsilon)\rangle| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{\tau}}, \ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}.$$

If $\lambda_0 \neq 0$, without loss of generality, suppose $\lambda_0 = \lambda(\epsilon_0) > 0$ $(0 < \epsilon_0 \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0)$. Then we have $\{\lambda(\epsilon) : \ \epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]\} \supset [0, \lambda_0]$. Let $\tilde{\omega}_* = (\omega_{01} + \lambda(\epsilon), \omega_{02})$. Let $I^*_{\epsilon_0} = \lambda^{-1}(\Pi_{\lambda_0})$ be the inverse image of Π_{λ_0} under the mapping λ, where Π_{λ_0} is defined as in Lemma 3.4. For $\epsilon \in \Pi_*$, $\lambda(\epsilon) \in \Pi_{\lambda_0}$ and then

$$|\langle k, \omega_*(\epsilon)\rangle| = |\frac{\omega_{*2}}{\omega_{02}}| \cdot |\langle k, \tilde{\omega}_*(\epsilon)\rangle| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{2\tau+2}}, \ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}.$$

Recall that λ maps $I^*_{\epsilon_0}$ onto Π_{λ_0}. Then the set $I^*_{\epsilon_0}$ has at least continuous carnality and so is non-empty. Moreover, when $\hat{\omega}(\epsilon)$ is differentiable, we have

$$0 < \text{meas}(\Pi_{\lambda_0}) = \text{meas}(\lambda(I^*_{\epsilon_0})) \leq c \cdot \text{meas}(I^*_{\epsilon_0}),$$

which suggests Π_{λ_0} has positive measure. □

Lemma 3.5 *Suppose the Brouwer degree of the frequency mapping* ω *at* ω_0 *on* Π *is not vanishes, i.e.* $\deg(\omega, \Pi, \omega_0) \neq 0$*. Let* $\hat{\omega}(\xi)$ *and* $\lambda(\xi)$ *be continuous on* Π*. Then there exists a sufficiently small* $\sigma_0 > 0$ *such that if* $\|\hat{\omega}\| \leq \sigma_0$ *and* $\|\lambda\| \leq \sigma_0$*, there exists at least one* $\xi_* \in \Pi$ *such that*

$$\omega_*(\xi_*) = \omega(\xi_*) + \hat{\omega}(\xi_*) = (1 + \lambda(\xi_*))\omega_0.$$

Proof: Let $\tilde{\omega}(\xi) = \hat{\omega}(\xi) - \lambda(\xi)\omega_0$, then $\|\tilde{\omega}\| \leq c\sigma$ with $c = 1 + |\omega_0|$. The theory of Brouwer degree shows that, if σ is sufficiently small, $\deg(\omega + \tilde{\omega}, \Pi, \omega_0) \neq 0$. Thus the equation $\omega(\xi) + \tilde{\omega}(\xi) = \omega_0$ has at least one solution ξ_* in Π. This proves the lemma. □

Lemma 3.6 *Let* $\omega(\xi) = (\omega_1(\xi), \ldots, \omega_{n-1}(\xi), \omega_{0n})$ *be continuous for* $\xi \in \Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$*, where* ω_{0n} *is a constant. Set*

$$\omega^\flat = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{n-1}), \quad \hat{\omega} = (\hat{\omega}_1, \ldots, \hat{\omega}_n), \quad \lambda = \hat{\omega}_n/\omega_{0n}.$$

Let ξ_0 *be an interior point in* Π*,* $\omega_0^\flat = \omega^\flat(\xi_0)$ *and* $\omega_0 = (\omega_0^\flat, \ \omega_{0n})$*. Suppose*

$$\deg(\omega^\flat, \ \Pi, \ \omega_0^\flat) \neq 0,$$

then there exists a sufficiently small constant $\sigma_0 > 0$ *such that if* $\|\hat{\omega}\| = \sigma < \sigma_0$*, there exists* $\xi_* \in \Pi$ *such that* $\omega_*(\xi_*) = (1 + \lambda(\xi_*))\omega_0$*. Moreover,* $\|\lambda\| = O(\sigma/c)$*.*

Proof: Consider the equation

$$\omega^\flat(\xi) + \hat{\omega}^\flat(\xi) = \big(1 + \lambda(\xi)\big)\omega_0^\flat.$$

Apply Lemma 3.5 to obtain that, if σ_0 is sufficiently small, the above equation has at least one solution $\xi_* \in \Pi$. The definition of λ yields $\omega_{*n} = \omega_{0n} + \hat{\omega}_n = (1+\lambda)\omega_{0n}$. Then we have proved the lemma. □

Proposition 3.3 *Let $\omega(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Omega(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}$ be continuous on $\Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and $|\Omega(\xi)| \geq c > 0$ holds for all $\xi \in \Pi$. Set $\xi_0 \in \Pi$ and $(\omega_0, \Omega_0) = (\omega(\xi_0), \Omega(\xi_0))$. Suppose*

$$\deg\,(\omega/\Omega,\ \Pi,\ \omega_0/\Omega_0) \neq 0.$$

Let $\lambda = \hat{\Omega}/\Omega$. Then there exists a sufficiently small $\sigma > 0$ such that if $\|\hat{\omega}\| + \|\hat{\Omega}\| \leq \sigma$, then there exists $\xi_* \in \Pi$ such that

$$(\omega_*(\xi_*), \Omega_*(\xi_*)) = \Omega_0^{-1} \cdot \Omega(\xi_*)(1 + \lambda(\xi_*))(\omega_0, \Omega_0).$$

Proof: Let $\tilde{\omega} = (\omega/\Omega, 1)$ and $\hat{\tilde{\omega}} = (\hat{\omega}/\Omega,\ \hat{\Omega}/\Omega)$. Then $(\omega_*, \Omega_*) = \Omega \cdot \big(\tilde{\omega} + \hat{\tilde{\omega}}\big)$. Apply Lemma 3.6 to $\tilde{\omega} = (\tilde{\omega}^\flat,\ \tilde{\omega}_{n+1})$ with $\tilde{\omega}^\flat = \omega/\Omega$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{n+1} = 1$ to complete the proof. □

Lemma 3.7 *Let $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open connected bounded domain and $\sigma > 0$. Let $\omega_0 \in O$, $\mu_0 \neq 0$, $(\omega_0, \nu_0) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau}$, where $\tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau}$ is defined as in (2.4) with $\bar{n} = 1$. Let $\hat{\mu}(\omega)$ be defined on O and*

$$f_k(\omega_0, \lambda) = \langle \omega_0, k\rangle + \nu_0 - (1+\lambda)^{-1}\big(\lambda \cdot \mu_0 - \hat{\mu}((1+\lambda)\omega_0)\big),$$

where λ is a small parameter. Denote by $I_\sigma = [-\sigma, +\sigma]$ and

$$I_\sigma^* = \left\{\lambda \in I_\sigma :\ |f_k(\omega_0, \lambda)| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{2\tau+1}},\quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}\right\}.$$

Then there exists a sufficiently small σ_0, depending on α and τ, such that if $\|\hat{\mu}\|_{C^1(\bar{O})} = \sigma \leq \sigma_0$, I_σ^* has positive measure with meas$(I_\sigma \setminus I_\sigma^*) = o(\sigma)$ as $\sigma \to 0$.

Proof: In view of $\mu_0 \neq 0$, there exists a sufficiently small $\sigma_0 > \sigma$ such that

$$|\partial_\lambda f_k(\lambda, \omega_0)| \geq |\mu_0|/2$$

holds for $|\lambda| \leq \sigma_0$ and $\|\hat{\mu}\|_1 \leq \sigma$.

For $\lambda \in I_\sigma$, we have

$$\big|(1+\lambda)^{-1} \cdot \lambda \cdot \mu_0 - (1+\lambda)^{-1} \cdot \hat{\mu}\big((1+\lambda)\omega_0\big)\big| \leq c\sigma.$$

Recall that $|\langle \omega_0, k\rangle + \nu_0| \geq \frac{\alpha}{|k|^\tau}$. If $c\sigma \leq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^\tau}$, then $|f_k(\lambda, \omega_0)| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^\tau}$ holds. Thus, we only need to consider the case of $c\sigma > \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^\tau}$.

For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}$, define

$$\Delta_k = \left\{\lambda \in I_\sigma :\ \ |f_k(\omega_0, \lambda)| < \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{2\tau+1}}\right\}.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{meas}(\Delta_k) \le \frac{\alpha}{\mu_0 |k|^{2\tau+1}} \le c\sigma \frac{1}{|k|^{\tau+1}}.$$

Note that $\tau > n-1$ and

$$I_\sigma \setminus I_\sigma^* \subset \bigcup_{2c\sigma|k|^\tau > \alpha} \Delta_k.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathrm{meas}(I_\sigma \setminus I_\sigma^*) \le \sum_{2c\sigma|k|^\tau > \alpha} \mathrm{meas}(\Delta_k) \le c\sigma \big(\frac{\sigma}{\alpha}\big)^{\frac{\tau-n+1}{\tau}}.$$

When σ_0 is sufficiently small such that $c(\frac{\sigma_0}{\alpha})^{\frac{\tau-n+1}{\tau}} < 1$, I_σ^* is non-empty with positive measure. □

Proposition 3.4

(1) Let $(\omega_0, \Omega_0) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau}$ *with* $\bar{n} = 1$, *and*

$$I_\sigma^* = \{\lambda \in I_\sigma : \ ((1+\lambda)\omega_0, \Omega_0) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha/2, 2\tau+1}\}. \tag{3.3}$$

If σ *is sufficiently small, then* I_σ^* *is non-empty and satisfies*

$$\mathit{meas}(I_\sigma \setminus I_\sigma^*) \le c\sigma \big(\frac{\sigma}{\alpha}\big)^{\frac{\tau-n+1}{\tau}}.$$

(2) Let $\omega(\xi) \in C(\Pi)$ *and* $\omega_0 = \omega(\xi_0)$. *Suppose* $\deg(\omega, \Pi, \omega_0) \ne 0$. *Let* $\omega_* = \omega + \hat{\omega}$ *and* $\Omega_* = \Omega_0 + \hat{\Omega}$. *Then, there exists a sufficiently small constant* $\sigma_0 > 0$, *such that if* $\|\hat{\omega}\| + \|\hat{\Omega}\| = \sigma \le \sigma_0$, *for* $\lambda \in I_\sigma^*$ *there exists* $\xi_* \in \Pi$ *such that*

$$(\omega_*(\xi_*), \Omega_*(\xi_*)) = (1 + \hat{\Omega}(\xi_*)/\Omega_0) \cdot \big((1+\lambda)\omega_0, \Omega_0\big).$$

Proof: The first conclusion follows directly from Lemma 3.7. Now we prove the second one.

Rewrite as

$$(\omega_*, \Omega_*) = (1 + \hat{\Omega}/\Omega_0) \cdot (\omega + \tilde{\omega}, \Omega_0)$$

where

$$\tilde{\omega} = (\Omega_0 + \hat{\Omega})^{-1} \cdot (\Omega_0 \cdot \hat{\omega} - \hat{\Omega} \cdot \omega).$$

Observe that $\|\tilde{\omega}\| \le c\sigma$. Lemma 3.5 shows, there exists a sufficiently small σ_0, such that if $\|\hat{\omega}\| + \|\hat{\Omega}\| = \sigma \le \sigma_0$ and $|\lambda| \le \sigma$, we have

$$\deg\big(\omega + \tilde{\omega}, \ \Pi, \ (1+\lambda)\omega_0\big) \ne 0.$$

Thus, for $\lambda \in I_{\sigma^*}$ there exists $\xi_* \in \Pi$ such that $\omega(\xi_*) + \tilde{\omega}(\xi_*) = (1+\lambda)\omega_0$. □

Proposition 3.5 *Let* $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *be an open bounded connected domain, and*

$$\Omega(\omega) = \beta + \omega \cdot M, \quad \omega \in O,$$

where $\beta_0 = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{\bar{n}})$ *and* M *is an* $n \times \bar{n}$ *constant matrix. Let* $\omega_0 \in O$ *and* $\Omega_0 = \Omega(\omega_0)$. *Suppose* $(\omega_0, \Omega_0) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau}$ *and* β *satisfies*

$$\langle l, \beta \rangle \neq 0, \quad \forall\, l \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Set $\hat{\omega}(\omega), \hat{\Omega}(\omega) \in C^1(O)$ *and*

$$\big(\omega_*(\omega),\, \Omega_*(\omega)\big) = \big(\omega,\, \Omega\big) + \big(\hat{\omega},\, \hat{\Omega}\big).$$

Then, there exists a sufficiently small σ_0, *such that if* $\|\hat{\omega}\|_1 + \|\hat{\Omega}\|_1 = \sigma \leq \sigma_0$, *there exists a non-empty subset* $I_\sigma^* \subset I_\sigma$ *with the estimate*

$$meas(I_\sigma \setminus I_\sigma^*) = o(\sigma).$$

Moreover, for any $\lambda \in I_\sigma^*$, *there exists* $\varpi \in O$ *such that*

$$\omega_*(\varpi) = (1+\lambda)\omega_0 \quad and \quad \big(\omega_*(\varpi), \Omega_*(\varpi)\big) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha/4, 2\tau+1}.$$

Proof: At first we note that if σ is sufficiently small, ω_* is also non-degenerate in ω on O. So without loss of generality, we assume $\omega_+ = \omega_*(\omega)$ as independent parameter. The inverse $\omega = \omega(\omega_+)$ is well defined in a little smaller domain $O_+ \subset O$. Then $\hat{\omega} \circ \omega(\omega_+)$ and $\hat{\Omega} \circ \omega(\omega_+)$ depend on ω_+ and satisfy $\|\hat{\omega}\|_1 + \|\hat{\Omega}\|_1 \leq c\sigma$ on O_+. Thus $\omega = \omega_+ - \hat{\omega}(\omega_+)$ and $\Omega \circ \omega(\omega_+) = \beta + \omega_+ \cdot M - \hat{\omega}(\omega_+) \cdot M$. Then we have

$$\Omega_* \circ \omega(\omega_+) = \beta + \omega_+ \cdot M + \tilde{\Omega}(\omega_+), \quad \tilde{\Omega}(\omega_+) = -\hat{\omega} \circ \omega(\omega_+) \cdot M + \hat{\Omega} \circ \omega(\omega_+).$$

Let $\omega_+ = (1+\lambda)\omega_0$ and $\varpi(\lambda) = \omega((1+\lambda)\omega_0)$. Then $\varpi(\lambda)$ is well defined for sufficiently small λ. Then we consider

$$\big(\omega_* \circ \varpi(\lambda),\; \Omega_* \circ \varpi(\lambda)\big) = \big((1+\lambda)\omega_0, \Omega_0 + \lambda\omega_0 \cdot M + \tilde{\Omega}((1+\lambda)\omega_0)\big)$$

Rewrite as

$$(1+\lambda)^{-1}\big(\omega_* \circ \varpi(\lambda),\; \Omega_* \circ \varpi(\lambda)\big) = \big(\omega_0, \Omega_0 - (1+\lambda)^{-1}(\lambda \cdot \beta - \tilde{\Omega}(\lambda)\big), \qquad (3.4)$$

where

$$\tilde{\Omega}(\lambda) = \tilde{\Omega}((1+\lambda)\omega_0).$$

To apply Lemma 3.7, for each fixed $l \in \mathcal{L}$, let $\nu_0 = \langle l, \Omega_0 \rangle$, $\mu_0 = \langle l, \beta \rangle, \hat{\mu} = \langle l, \tilde{\Omega} \rangle$. Then there exists a sufficiently small $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that for $\sigma \leq \sigma_0$, we have $I_\sigma^{l*} \subset I_\sigma$ with the estimate

$$\text{meas}(I_\sigma \setminus I_\sigma^{l*}) = o(\sigma),$$

such that for each $l \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{l*}$,

$$\big|\langle \omega_0, k \rangle + \nu_0 - (1+\lambda)^{-1}(\lambda \cdot \mu_0 - \hat{\mu})\big| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|k|^{2\tau+1}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}. \qquad (3.5)$$

Define

$$I_\sigma^* = \bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{L}} I_\sigma^{l*}.$$

Recalling $\mathcal{L} = \{l \in \mathbb{Z}^{\bar{n}} :\ 1 \leq |l| \leq 2\}$, we arrive at

$$\mathrm{meas}(I_\sigma \setminus I_\sigma^*) = o(\sigma).$$

Moreover, in view of the definition (2.4), the assumption $(\omega_0, \Omega_0) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau}$ shows

$$|\langle l, \Omega_0 \rangle| \geq \alpha \quad \text{for } l \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Combining $\lambda \in I_\sigma$ with $\|\hat{\omega}\|_1 + \|\hat{\Omega}\|_1 = \sigma \leq \sigma_0$, for sufficiently small σ, we have

$$|\langle l, (1+\lambda)^{-1}\Omega_* \circ \varpi(\lambda)\rangle| = |\langle l, \Omega_0 - (1+\lambda)^{-1}(\lambda \cdot \beta - \tilde{\Omega}(\lambda))\rangle| \geq \alpha/2 \ \text{ for } l \in \mathcal{L}. \tag{3.6}$$

Summarizing the above estimates (3.5) and (3.6), it follows that for $\lambda \in I_\sigma^*$,

$$\big(\omega_0,\ (1+\lambda)^{-1}\Omega_* \circ \varpi(\lambda)\big) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha/2, 2\tau+1}.$$

If $\sigma_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\big(\omega_* \circ \varpi(\lambda),\ \Omega_* \circ \varpi(\lambda)\big) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha/4, 2\tau+1}.$$

Note that $\omega_*(\varpi) = (1+\lambda)\omega_0$. Thus we prove this proposition. □

4 Application of Theorems

In this section, by virtue of the previous discussion on the stability of Diophantine frequencies, our Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 can be applied to various situations and obtain interesting results, some of which have been displayed in the literature; while some are rather novel. This wide application accounts for the advantage of our theorems.

- *The classical KAM theorem.*

We first point that the Kolmogorov non-degeneracy condition and Rüssmann's non-degeneracy condition are stable under small perturbation. Thus, by standard measure estimate, for most of parameter ξ, $\omega_*(\xi)$ belongs to the Diophantine set $O_{\alpha,\tau}$. Then Theorem 2.1 immediately shows, H possesses an invariant torus with the frequencies $\omega_*(\xi)$, as is stated in [15, 7, 16, 17, 20].

- *KAM tori with prescribed frequency.*

We indicate that the result in [21] follows obviously from Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 3.5. However, due to the method of introducing external parameter, [21] only presents the existence of invariant tori with one single prescribed frequency vector, and fails to obtain the smoothness of invariant tori with respect to the parameter. However, Theorem 2.1 can tell not only the existence of invariant tori, but also the C^m-smoothness in the parameter. In fact, the parameterized Diophantine frequencies in $\omega_*(\Pi)$ are C^m-smooth w.r.t. ξ, and so are the corresponding invariant tori.

In particular, by the theory of topological degree, our theorems can apply to some hamiltonian that only continuously depends on the parameter. See the following instance.

Consider the hamiltonian (2.1) with

$$\omega(\xi) = (\xi_1^{2l_1+1}, \ldots, \xi_n^{2l_n+1}), \quad \Pi = \{\xi :\ |\xi_i| \leq 1, i = 1, \ldots, n\},$$

where $l_i \geq 0$ are integers. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$. If ϵ is small, the theory of topological degree implies

$$\omega_*(\Pi) \supset O = \{\omega = (\omega_1, \cdots \omega_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ |\omega_i| \leq (1-\alpha)^{2l_i+1}, \ i = 1, \dots n\}.$$

Note that O is also a domain. Thus, for the parameterized hamiltonian $H(\xi; \theta, I)$, all the invariant tori with frequencies in $O \cap O_{\alpha,\tau}$ persist. Moreover, these invariant tori depend on the parameter C^m-smoothly in Whitney's sense [19].

- *KAM theorem with Bruno non-degeneracy condition.*

Consider the hamiltonian (2.1) and $\omega(\xi)$ satisfies the Bruno non-degeneracy condition (3.1). Proposition 3.1 illustrates, for any $\omega_0 = \omega(\xi_0) \in O_\alpha$, there exists an one-parameter continuous family of invariant tori with the frequencies $(1+\lambda(\eta))\omega_0$, where the parameter η is close to zero and $\lambda = O(|\eta| + \sigma)$ with $\sigma = \frac{\epsilon}{2r\alpha}$. Especially, when the hamiltonian depends on the parameter analytically, the obtained family can be proved analytically dependent on η near zero.

- *KAM theorem for hamiltonian system with two degrees of freedom.*

Let $H(\epsilon; \theta, I) = \langle \omega_0, I\rangle + \epsilon P(\epsilon; \theta, I)$, where P is real analytic in (θ, I) on $D(s,r) \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$, and C^m-smooth in a small parameter ϵ on $I_{\epsilon_0} = [0, \epsilon_0]$. Suppose $\omega_0 = (\omega_{01}, \omega_{02}) \in O_{\alpha,\tau}$. Applying Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 3.2, we have the following results:

There exists a sufficiently small constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$, such that if

$$\|\epsilon P\|_{\alpha, \Pi \times D(s,r)} = \epsilon \leq \alpha r s^{\tau'} \gamma = \epsilon_0,$$

where $\tau' = n + (m+1)(2\tau+2) + m$, there always exists an non-empty set $I^*_{\epsilon_0} \subset I_{\epsilon_0}$ such that for $\epsilon \in I^*_{\epsilon_0}$, $H(\epsilon; \theta, I)$ has invariant tori with frequencies $\omega_*(\epsilon) = \omega_0 + \hat{\omega}_0(\epsilon) \in O_{\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2\tau+2}$ satisfying $|\hat{\omega}_0(\epsilon)| \leq 2\epsilon/r$. Moreover, for $m = 0$, $I^*_{\epsilon_0}$ has continuous cardinality; for $m \geq 1$, $I^*_{\epsilon_0}$ has positive measure.

The above result implies that the invariant tori with Diophantine frequencies for an integrable hamiltonian with two degrees of freedom never isolate, which was pointed and proved by Elliasson in [8].

Note that here we do not require analytic condition of the hamiltonian in the parameter; therefore, we cannot obtain an accurate measure estimate for I_{ϵ_0}. In [22], the authors considered the same problem for analytic hamiltonian in both the phase variables (θ, I) and the small parameter ϵ. Without imposing any non-degeneracy condition in advance, the authors obtained a similar result with $\mathrm{meas}(I_{\epsilon_0} \setminus I^*_{\epsilon_0}) = o(\epsilon_0)$ as $\epsilon_0 \to 0$.

- *Elliptic lower dimensional KAM-tori.*

1. Case of one normal dimension:

Consider the hamiltonian (2.2) with $\bar{n} = 1$ and $\Omega(\xi) \equiv \Omega_0$. Suppose $(\omega_0, \Omega_0) = (\omega(\xi_0), \Omega_0) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau}$ and $\omega(\xi)$ satisfies $\deg(\omega, \Pi, \omega_0) \neq 0$. By Proposition 3.4 and Theorem 2.2, there exist sufficiently small constants $\gamma > 0$ and $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that if

$$\|P\|_{\Pi; D(s,r)} = \epsilon \leq \alpha r^2 s^{\tau'} \gamma \ \text{ with } \tau' = n + (m+1)(2\tau+1) + m,$$

and $\sigma = \epsilon/2r^2 \leq \sigma_0$, there exists $I^*_\sigma \subset I_\sigma$ with $\mathrm{meas}(I_\sigma \setminus I^*_\sigma) = o(\sigma)$ as $\sigma \to 0$, such that for all $\lambda \in I^*_\sigma$ there exist $\xi_* \in \Pi$ and $\tilde{\lambda} = \hat{\Omega}(\xi_*)/\Omega_0$ with $|\tilde{\lambda}| \leq \sigma/|\Omega_0|$, such that the hamiltonian $H(\xi_*, \cdot)$ has an invariant torus with tangential frequency $(1+\tilde{\lambda})(1+\lambda)\omega_0$ and normal frequency $(1+\tilde{\lambda})\Omega_0$.

Remark 4.1 *Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 2.2 can also be applied to* $H(\xi; \theta, I, z, \bar{z})$ *with* $\bar{n} = 1$ *and* $\Omega = \Omega(\xi)$. *Let* $(\omega_0, \Omega_0) = (\omega(\xi_0), \Omega(\xi_0)) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau}$ *and suppose* $\deg(\omega/\Omega,\ \Pi,\ \omega_0/\Omega_0) \neq 0$. *Then we can arrive at an analogous result.*

2. Case of multiple normal dimensions:

Consider the hamiltonian

$$H(\omega; I, \theta, z, \bar{z}) = \langle \omega, I \rangle + \langle \Omega(\omega), z\,\bar{z} \rangle + P(\omega; \theta, I, z, \bar{z})$$

as in Theorem 2.2 with $m \geq 1$, where the parameter $\omega \in O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The normal frequency vector is

$$\Omega(\omega) = \beta + \omega \cdot M, \quad \omega \in O,$$

where $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{\bar{n}})$ and M is an $n \times \bar{n}$ constant matrix.

Suppose $\langle l, \beta \rangle \neq 0$ for $l \in \mathcal{L}$. Define

$$O_* = \{\omega \in O : \ (\omega,\ \Omega(\omega)) \in \tilde{O}_{\alpha,\tau}\}.$$

Then we can verify that O_* occupies a large portion of measure in O for sufficiently small constant $\alpha > 0$.

Set $\omega_0 \in O_*$ and $\Omega_0 = \Omega(\omega_0)$. Then the combination of Proposition 3.5 and Theorem 2.2 yields, there exist sufficiently small constants γ and σ_0 such that if

$$\|P\|_{\bar{O}; D(s,r)} = \epsilon \leq \frac{\alpha}{4} r^2 s^{\tau'} \gamma \ \text{ with } \tau' = n + (m+1)(2\tau+1) + m,$$

and $\sigma = \frac{\epsilon}{2r^2\alpha} \leq \sigma_0$, there exists an non-empty Cantor subset $I_\sigma^* \subset I_\sigma$ and for $\lambda \in I_\sigma^*$ there exists $\varpi \in O$ such that the hamiltonian $H(\varpi, \cdot)$ has an invariant torus with frequencies $\big(\omega_*(\varpi),\ \Omega_*(\varpi)\big) = \big((1+\lambda)\omega_0,\ \Omega_*(\varpi)\big)$. Moreover, we have $\text{meas}(I_\sigma \setminus I_\sigma^*) = o(\sigma)$ as $\sigma \to 0$.

In the case of $M = 0$, the above result implies that obtained by Bourgain in [2]. We indicate that our assumption is a little stronger than in [2], where only the first Melnikov's condition is required. Nevertheless, under the second Melnikov condition, we can obtain the normal form for the persisting invariant tori, which provides the linear stability of these invariant tori and reveals more dynamical information.

Note that by some asymptotic property of the normal frequencies, Proposition 3.5 can be extended to some infinite dimensional hamiltonian as showed in [3].

5 Proof of Theorems

In this section, we mainly prove Theorem 2.1 and omit the proof of Theorem 2.2 since the idea is the same only with some modified KAM estimates. Our proof is based on a KAM iteration. The key is to choose a suitable constant α in the small divisor conditions. Usually the constant α decreases as the KAM step proceeds; here it will be increasing. Moreover, we shall present an explicit extension of small divisors rather than using Whitney's extension theorem[19]. In particular, even though small divisor condition does not hold, our extension still works, which plays an important role in separating the KAM iteration and non-degeneracy condition. We should note that the idea of the small divisor extension is also used by Elliasson in [8]. In fact, the spirit in our proof is more or less similar to that in [8]. More precisely, the existence of KAM tori depend on existence of Diophantine frequencies in the final KAM step (the limit of KAM iteration).

KAM-step. We summarize our KAM step in the following iteration lemma.

Lemma 5.1 (Iteration Lemma) *Consider the following hamiltonian*

$$H(\xi;\theta,I)=N(\xi;I)+P(\xi;\theta,I),$$

where $N(\xi;I)=\langle\omega(\xi),I\rangle$. *Let* $\alpha\le\alpha_*\le 2\alpha$, $\tau>n-1, m\ge 0, \tau'=n+m+\tau(m+1)$. *Assume* $\omega\in C^m(\Pi_0)$ *and*

$$\|P\|_{\alpha_*,\Pi_0\times D(s,r)}\le\epsilon=\alpha r\rho^{\tau'}E.$$

Set $s_+=s-5\rho$, $\eta=\sqrt{E}$, $r_+=\eta r$. *Then the following conclusions hold:*
(i) For any $\xi\in\Pi_0$ *there exists a symplectic mapping*

$$\Phi(\xi;\cdot,\,\cdot):D(s_+,\,r_+)\to D(s,r),$$

which is real analytic in (I,θ) *on* $D(s_+,r_+)$ *and* C^m*-smooth in* ξ *on* Π_0 *such that*

$$\|W(\Phi-id)\|_{\alpha_*,\Pi\times D(s_+,r_+)},\quad\|W(\mathcal{D}\Phi-Id)W^{-1}\|_{\alpha_*,\Pi_0\times D(s_+,r_+)}\le cE,$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ *is the differentiation operator with respect to* (θ,I) *and* $W=diag(\rho^{-1}I_n,r^{-1}I_n)$ *with* I_n *being the n-th unit matrix.*
(ii) There exists a real analytic hamiltonian

$$H_+(\xi;I,\theta)=N_+(\xi;I)+P_+(\xi;\theta,I)$$

defined on $D(s_+,r_+)$, *that is* C^m*-smooth in* $\xi\in\Pi_0$, *where*

$$N_+(\xi;I)=\langle\omega_+(\xi),I\rangle,\quad\omega_+=\omega+\hat\omega$$

with the estimate

$$\|\hat\omega\|_{\alpha_*,C^m(\Pi_0)}\le\epsilon/r.$$

P_+ *denotes the new perturbation satisfying*

$$\|P_+\|_{\alpha_*,\Pi_0\times D(s_+,r_+)}\le\epsilon_+=\alpha_+r_+\rho_+^{\tau'}E_+.$$

Here,

$$\rho_+=\frac{1}{2}\rho,\quad E_+=c(m,n,\tau)\cdot E^{\frac{3}{2}},\quad\alpha\le\alpha_+\le 2\alpha.$$

(iii) Set $e^{-K\rho}=E$ *and*

$$O^K_\alpha=\big\{\omega\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ |\langle\omega,k\rangle|\ge\frac{\alpha}{|k|^\tau},\ 0<|k|\le K.\big\}$$

Suppose $2K^{\tau+1}\epsilon \le (\alpha_+ - \alpha)r$ *and define*

$$\Pi = \big\{\xi \in \Pi_0 : \quad \omega(\xi) \in O_\alpha^K\big\}, \quad \Pi_+ = \big\{\xi \in \Pi_0 : \quad \omega_+(\xi) \in O_{\alpha_+}^{K_+}\big\}, \tag{5.1}$$

where $K_+ > K$ *satisfies* $e^{-K_+\rho_+} = E_+$. *Then we have* $\Pi_+ \subset \Pi$.
Moreover,

$$H \circ \Phi(\xi;\theta,I) = H_+(\xi;\theta,I) = N_+(\xi;I) + P_+(\xi;\theta,I), \quad \textit{for} \ \ \xi \in \Pi.$$

Proof of Iteration Lemma. Our KAM step is standard and we divide it into several parts. Here and below we use c to indicate the constants which are independent of KAM steps.

A. Truncation. Set $R = P(\xi;\theta,0) + \langle P_I(\xi;\theta,0), I\rangle$. It follows easily that $\|R\|_{\Pi_0\times D(s,r)} \le 2\|P\|_{\Pi_0\times D(s,r)} \le 2\epsilon$. Let

$$R = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^n} R_k(\xi;I)e^{\mathrm{i}\langle \mathrm{k},\,\theta\rangle}$$

and

$$R^K = \sum_{|k|\le K} R_k(\xi;I)e^{\mathrm{i}\langle \mathrm{k},\,\theta\rangle}.$$

Then

$$\|R - R^K\|_{\Pi_0\times D(s-\rho,r)} \le 2\epsilon e^{-K\rho}.$$

B. Construction of symplectic mapping. The symplectic mapping is generated by a hamiltonian flow mapping at 1-time, that is, $\Phi = X_F^t|_{t=1}$, where F is the generation function. It follows that

$$H\circ\Phi = N_+ + \{N,F\} + R^K - [R] + P_+,$$

where $[R]$ denotes the average of R on $\mathbb{T}^n$ and $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ the Poisson bracket. The new normal form is $N_+ = N + [R] = \langle I, \omega_+(\xi)\rangle$, $\omega_+ = \omega + \hat\omega$ with $\hat\omega = \partial_I[R]$.

$$P_+ = \int_0^1 \{(1-t)\{N,F\} + R^K, F\}\circ X_F^t\,dt + (P - R^K)\circ\Phi.$$

We choose F such that

$$\{N,F\} + R^K - [R] = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

Let $\{F_k\}$ and $\{R_k\}$ be relevant Fourier coefficients with respect to θ. Thus, $F_k = 0$ with $k = 0$ or $|k| > K$; and for $\langle\omega(\xi),k\rangle \ne 0$,

$$F_k = \frac{1}{\mathrm{i}\langle\omega(\xi),\mathrm{k}\rangle}R_k, \quad 0 < |k| \le K.$$

Thus, it follows

$$P_+ = \int_0^1 \{(1-t)[R] + tR^K, F\}\circ X_F^t\,dt + (P - R^K)\circ\Phi.$$

C. Extension of small divisors. Now we define a $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$-smooth function $\varphi(t)$ as

$$\varphi(t)=\begin{cases} 0, & |t|\le \dfrac{1}{2},\\ 1, & |t|\ge 1. \end{cases}$$

For $h>0$, let $\varphi_h(t)=\varphi(t/h)$. Then $\varphi_h(t)\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with

$$|\frac{d^\ell}{dt^\ell}\varphi_h(t)|\le c_\ell/h^l,\quad \forall t\in\mathbb{R},\ \ \forall \ell\ge 1, \tag{5.3}$$

where c_ℓ is a constant depending on ℓ.

Let

$$h=\frac{\alpha}{|k|^\tau},\quad t_k(\xi)=\langle\omega(\xi),k\rangle,\quad g_k(\xi)=\frac{\varphi_h(t_k(\xi))}{\mathrm{i}\langle\omega(\xi),\mathrm{k}\rangle}.$$

Recall the definition of Π in (5.1). Then $g_k(\xi)=\frac{1}{\mathrm{i}\langle\omega(\xi),\mathrm{k}\rangle}$ for $\xi\in\Pi$. Note that even if $\Pi=\emptyset$, the extension of $g_k(\xi)$ is still well defined on Π_0. Furthermore, $g_k(\xi)\in C^m(\Pi_0)$ with the estimate

$$\Big|\frac{\partial^\beta g_k}{\partial\xi^\beta}(\xi)\Big|\le ch^{-|\beta|-1}|k|^{|\beta|},\quad \xi\in\Pi_0,\ \forall\ |\beta|\le m.$$

Now we extend F_k from Π to the whole set Π_0 by setting

$$\widetilde{F}_k(\xi;I)=g_k(\xi)R_k(\xi;I)=\frac{\varphi_h(t_k(\xi))}{\mathrm{i}\langle\omega(\xi),\mathrm{k}\rangle}R_k(\xi;I),\ 0<|k|\le K.$$

Let $\widetilde{F}(\xi;I,\theta)=\sum_{0<|k|\le K}\widetilde{F}_k(\xi;I)e^{\mathrm{i}\langle k,\theta\rangle}$ and we have

$$\|\widetilde{F}\|_{\alpha*,\Pi_0\times D(r,s-\rho)}\le\frac{c\epsilon}{\alpha\rho^{\tau'}},\quad \tau'=n+\tau(m+1)+m.$$

D. Estimates for symplectic mapping. It follows from Cauchy estimate that

$$\|WX_{\widetilde{F}}\|_{\alpha*,\Pi_0\times D(r,s-2\rho)}\le\frac{c\epsilon}{\alpha r\rho^{\tau'}}=cE,$$

where $W=\mathrm{diag}(\rho^{-1}I_n,r^{-1}I_n)$.

Thus, if $0<\eta\le\frac{1}{8}$ and $cE\le\frac{1}{8}$, for all $\xi\in\Pi$ we have

$$\Phi(\xi;\cdot,\cdot)=X^1_{\widetilde{F}}:D(r\eta,s-3\rho)\to D(2r\eta,s-2\rho).$$

Cauchy estimate again yields

$$\|W(\Phi-id)\|_{\alpha*,\Pi_0\times D(s-5\rho,\eta r)},\ \|W(\mathcal{D}\Phi-Id)W^{-1}\|_{\alpha*,\Pi_0\times D(s-5\rho,\eta r)}\le cE.$$

E. New error terms. Following the same approach as in the classical KAM theorem, we arrive at

$$\|P_+\|_{\alpha*,\Pi_0\times D(s_+,r_+)}<c\frac{\epsilon^2}{\alpha r\rho^{\tau'}}+c(\eta^2+e^{-K\rho})\epsilon,$$

where c is a constant depending only on n and τ. The choice of the parameters η and K implies,

$$\|P_+\|_{\alpha *,\Pi_0\times D(s_+,r_+)} \leq c\epsilon E \leq \alpha_+ r_+ \rho_+^{\tau'} E_+ = \epsilon_+.$$

where $\alpha_+,\ \rho_+,\ r_+, E_+$ are given as in the lemma.

Recall that $\hat{\omega} = \partial_I[R]$ and we have $\|\hat{\omega}\|_{\alpha *, C^m(\Pi_0)} \leq \epsilon/r$. Suppose $2K^{\tau+1}\epsilon \leq (\alpha_+ - \alpha)r$, and then $\Pi_+ \subset \Pi$ holds.

Iteration. Now we choose some suitable sequences of parameters so that the above step can iterate infinitely.

At the initial step, let $\rho_0 = s/20$, $r_0 = r$, $E_0 = 2\cdot 20^{\tau'}\gamma > 0$, $\alpha_0 = (1-\frac{1}{2})\alpha$ and $\epsilon_0 = E_0\alpha_0 r_0 \rho_0^{\tau'}$. Let $\eta_0 = E_0{}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $e^{-K_0\rho_0} = E_0$.

For $j \geq 0$, we define

$$\rho_{j+1} = \frac{1}{2}\rho_j,\ r_{j+1} = \eta_j r_j,\ E_{j+1} = cE_j^{\frac{3}{2}},\ \alpha_{j+1} = (1-\frac{1}{2^{j+3}})\alpha.$$
$$\epsilon_j = E_j\alpha_j r_j \rho_j^{\tau'}, \quad \eta_j = E_j^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad e^{-K_j\rho_j} = E_j.$$

Note that $\alpha_j \leq \alpha \leq 2\alpha_j$. It is easy to verify $cE_j \leq (cE_0)^{(\frac{3}{2})^j}$.

Now we check the assumption $2K_j^{\tau+1}\epsilon_j \leq (\alpha_{j+1}-\alpha_j)r_j$. This is equivalent to prove $F_j = 2^{j+3}K_j^{\tau+1}\epsilon_j/r_j \leq \alpha$. Notice that

$$\frac{F_{j+1}}{F_j} = 2cE_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left(\frac{K_{j+1}}{K_j}\right)^{\tau+1}.$$

It follows from $K_j = -\ln E_j/\rho_j$ that

$$K_{j+1}/K_j = 2\ln E_{j+1}/\ln E_j = (2\ln\tilde{c} + 3\ln E_j)/\ln E_j \leq 3.$$

Then we have $F_{j+1} \leq cE_j^{\frac{1}{2}}F_j$. Note that

$$F_0 = 4\epsilon_0 K_0^{\tau+1}/r_0 = 2\cdot 20^{1-\tau'}s^{\tau'-1}E_0(\ln|E_0|)^{\tau+1}\alpha,$$

which implies for all fixed $s, r > 0$ and sufficiently small E_0, $F_k \leq \alpha$ holds for any $k \geq 0$. Hence we immediately derive $\Pi_{j+1} \subset \Pi_j$ from the assumption $2K_j^{\tau+1}\epsilon_j \leq (\alpha_{j+1}-\alpha_j)r_j$.

Let $\Pi_0 = \Pi$ and $D_j = D(s_j, r_j)$. Applying Iteration Lemma 5.1, we have a sequence of monotonously decreasing closed sets $\{\Pi_j\}$, and a sequence of symplectic mappings $\{\Phi_j\}$ such that for each $\xi \in \Pi$, $\Phi_j(\xi;\cdot,\cdot) : D_{j+1} \to D_j$ with the estimates

$$\|W_j(\Phi_j - id)\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D_{j+1}},\ \ \|W_j(\mathcal{D}\Phi_j - Id)W_j^{-1}\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D_{j+1}} \leq cE_j.$$

Meanwhile, we have a sequence of hamiltonian $H_j = N_j + P_j$, where $N_j(\xi; I) = \langle \omega_j(\xi), I\rangle$ and P_j satisfies

$$\|P_j\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D_j} \leq \epsilon_j = \alpha_j r_j \rho_j^{\tau'} E_j.$$

For any $j \geq 0$, $\omega_j \in C^m(\Pi)$ and $\omega_{j+1} = \omega_j + \hat{\omega}_j$ with $\|\hat{\omega}_j\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)} \leq \epsilon_j/r_j$.

Furthermore, for $\xi \in \Pi_j$ we have

$$H_{j+1} = H_j \circ \Phi_j = N_{j+1} + P_{j+1},$$

Denote by $\Phi^j = \Phi_0 \circ \Phi_1 \circ \cdots \Phi_{j-1}$ with $\Phi^0 = \mathrm{id}$. Then the monotonousness of $\{\Pi_j\}$ shows, $H_j = H \circ \Phi^j$ holds for $\xi \in \Pi_j$.

Convergence of iteration. Now we prove the convergence of the KAM iteration. In the same way as in [15, 21], it follows that if $c^{\frac{1}{2}} E_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\|W_0 \mathcal{D}\Phi^j W_j^{-1}\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D_j} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{j}(1 + cE_j) < 2.$$

Therefore,

$$\|W_0(\Phi^j - \Phi^{j-1})\|_{\alpha,\Pi_j\times D_j},\ \|W_0\mathcal{D}(\Phi^j - \Phi^{j-1})\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D_j} \leq cE_j.$$

Let $D_* = D(0, \frac{1}{2}s)$ and $\Phi_* = \lim_{j\to\infty} \Phi^j$. Since Φ^j is affine in I, Φ^j converges to Φ_* on $D(s/2, r/2)$ with the estimate

$$\|W_0(\Phi_* - id)\|_{\alpha,\Pi\times D(s/2,r/2)} \leq cE_0.$$

Denote by $P_j \to P_*$ and $\omega_j \to \omega_*$. Then P_* is real analytic with respect to (I, θ) on $D(r/2, s/2)$ and C^m-smooth in ξ on Π. Moreover, $\frac{\partial^\ell P_*}{\partial I^\ell}|_{I=0} = 0,\ |\ell| \leq 1$. Note that $\omega_j = \omega + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \hat{\omega}_i$. Then we have

$$\|\omega_* - \omega_j\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)} \leq \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon_j}{r_j} = \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \alpha_i \rho_i^{\tau'} E_i \leq \frac{2\epsilon_j}{r_j}.$$

Especially,

$$\|\omega_* - \omega\|_{\alpha,C^m(\Pi)} \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{r}.$$

Let $\Pi_* = \{\xi \in \Pi :\ \omega_*(\xi) \in O_\alpha\}$. In the sequel we show $\Pi_* \subset \Pi_j$ for all $j \geq 0$. In fact, recall $F_j = 2^{j+3}\epsilon_j K_j^{\tau+1}/r_j \leq \alpha$. Then, for $\xi \in \Pi_*$ and $0 < |k| \leq K_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle\omega_j, k\rangle| &\geq |\langle\omega_*, k\rangle| - |\langle\omega_* - \omega_j, k\rangle| \geq \frac{\alpha}{|k|^\tau} - \frac{2\epsilon_j}{r_j} K_j \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{|k|^\tau} - \frac{\alpha}{2^{j+2}} \cdot \frac{1}{K_j^\tau} \geq \frac{\alpha_j}{|k|^\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\Pi_* \subset \bigcap_{j\geq 0} \Pi_j$. Finally, we arrive at $H \circ \Phi_* = H_* = N_* + P_*$ for $\xi \in \Pi_*$.

References

[1] V.I. Arnold, Proof of a theorem of A. N. Kolmogorov on the persistence of Quasi-perodic motions under small perturbations of the Hamiltonian, *Russ. Math. Surv.* **18:5** (1963) 9-36.

[2] J. Bourgain, On Melnikovs persistency problem, *Math. Res. Lett.* **4** (1997) 445-458.

[3] M. Berti, L. Biasco L, Branching of Cantor manifolds of elliptic tori and applications to PDEs, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **305** (2011) 741-796.

[4] H. W. Broer, G. B. Huitema, F. Takens, Unfoldings of quasi-perodic tori, *Mem. A. M. S.* **18:421** (1990), 1-81.

[5] A. D. Bruno, Analytic form of differential equations, *Transactions of the Moscow Math. Soc.* **25** (1971) 131-288.

[6] C. Q. Cheng, Birkhoff-Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser tori in convex hamiltonian systems, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **177** (1996) 529-559.

[7] L.H. Eliasson, Perturbations of stable invariant tori for hamiltonian systems, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super Pisa* **15** (1988) 115-147.

[8] L.H. Eliasson, B. Fayad, R. Krikorian, Around the stability of KAM tori, *Preprint* April 22, 2013

[9] A. N. Kolmogorov, Preservation of conditionally perodic motions for a small change in Hamilton's function, *Dakl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **98:4** (1954) 527-530.

[10] V. K. Melnikov, On some cases of conservation of conditionally periodic motions under a small change of the Hamiltonian function, *Sov. Math. Dokl.* **6:6** (1965) 1592-1596.

[11] V. K. Melnikov, A family of conditionally periodic solutions of a Hamiltonian systems, *Sov. Math. Dokl.* **9** (1968) 882-886.

[12] J. Moser, On invariant curves of area preserving mappings of an annulus, *Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Gött. Math. Phys. Kl. II* (1962)1-20.

[13] J. Moser. Convergent series expansions for quasi-periodic motions, *Math. Ann.* **169** (1976) 136-176.

[14] J. Pöchel, On elliptic lower dimensional tori in Hamiltonian systems, *Math. Z.* **202:4** (1989) 559-608.

[15] J. Pöschel, A Lecture on the Classical KAM Theorem, *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.* **69** (2001) 707-732.

[16] H. Rüssmann, On twist hamiltonian, Talk on the Colloque International: Mécanique Céleste et Systémes hamiltoniens, Marseille. 1990.

[17] H. Rüssmann, Invariant Tori in Non-degenerate Nearly Integrable hamiltonian systems, *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics* **6: 2**(2001) 119-204.

[18] M. B. Sevryuk, Partial preservation of frequencies in KAM theory, *Nonlinearity* **19:5** (2006) 1099-1140.

[19] H. Whitney, Analytical extensions of differentiable functions defined in closed sets, *Trans. A. M. S.* **36** (1934) 63-89.

[20] J. Xu, J. You, Q. Qiu. Invariant tori of nearly integrable hamiltonian systems with degeneracy. *Math. Z.* **226**(1997). 375-386.

[21] J. Xu, J. You. Persistence of the non-twist torus in nearly integrable hamiltonian systems, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **138:7** (2010) 2385-2395.

[22] L. Zhang, J. Xu. Persistence of invariant torus in hamiltonian systems with two-degree of freedom, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **338** (2008) 793-802.